

**Development Engineering Advisory Board Meeting**  
**May 7, 2009**  
**2:30 – 4:30 p.m.**  
**Public Service Center**  
**6<sup>th</sup> Floor Training Room**

In attendance: Board members – Eric Golemo, Greg Jellison, Jerry Nutter, Tim Schauer, Steve Wall; County staff – Ginger Blair, Kevin Gray, Ali Safayi, Sue Stepan

Board members not in attendance: John Graves, Steve Madsen

Visitors: David Bottamini, Carolyn Heniges, Dan Kaler, Ken Pearrow, Marty Snell

Administrative Actions

- Nutter started the meeting with introduction of audience and board members.
- The April 9, 2009, meeting minutes were adopted without edits.
- With the adoption of the April 9 minutes, the parking lot is now empty. All items have been moved to the 2009-2010 work plan.
- There were no new correspondences to review.

Public Works – Staff Pooling

Gray provided an update on a Public Works engineering reorganization. He explained that Development Engineering revenues are not enough to support all of the current staff. An internal team was formed to evaluate options for pooling the department's engineers and inspectors. The result was the following restructuring:

1. Inspectors will be consolidated and report directly to Carolyn Heniges. This includes capital construction, utilities, and development engineering inspection. The consolidation of resources will ease the management of the fluctuating work loads.
2. The review engineers from the Development Engineering Program will be combined with the design engineers of the Capital Engineering Program. Design and review engineers will work as one group to provide flexibility for the work load and for cross-training/career development.
3. Stepan will continue to manage the administrative functions of the Development Engineering Program and report directly to Gray. Planning technician and office assistant staff will report to Stepan.

This is a permanent change. Gray does not see the department staffing up for the next few years. This organizational model is intended to allow the flexibility to address the variable work load.

Financial Performance – First Quarter

Stepan referred to the financial report included in the meeting packet.

Stepan lead the group through the report, with the following being discussed:

1. Revenue and Expenses – Actuals First Quarter
  - This document is a high level snapshot of revenue and expenses.
2. Revenue Forecast and Actual Receipts

- This document shows the actual revenue receipts for each month. Revenues are coming in lower than the budgeted forecasts. Historically, revenue has been fairly steady each month, without significant seasonal fluctuations.
- The Development Engineering program responds to revenue fluctuations by moving staff to capital project work.
- 3. General Fund and Reimbursable Expenses
  - This document shows the expenses related to work that is not directly connected to development review fees.
  - Policy direction from the BOCC may be needed as to the level to perform these activities. Services include: customer service, internal inquiries, records requests, and DEAB support.
- 4. Specific Project Expenses and 2009 Revenue
  - This document compares the revenue and expenses for each project permit.
  - An example of a financial challenge is the Padden Employment Center project. This is a significant project that has the potential to create new jobs for the community. Development Engineering received around \$2,700 in fees for the preliminary site plan review (PSR). The review expenses through March are \$4,600 over budget and the project is not yet complete.
  - Preliminary site plan review fees are a flat rate, regardless of the size or complexity of the project. The same fees are charged for a coffee kiosk as a large commercial center.
- 5. Specific Project Expenses for Revenue Prior to 2009
  - This document shows project expenses in which the fees were received in 2008 and the revenues went to Community Development. The projects are still active and staff is tracking time against them.
- 6. Performance Measures
  - This document provides information for the first three months of the year.

Stepan told the group that this financial information will be provided at each of DEAB's monthly meetings.

#### Debrief BOCC Work Session / Refine 2009 Work Plan

Stepan informed the group that a memorialization of the work session with the Board of County Commissioners was included in the meeting packet. She asked the DEAB how they would like to proceed and prioritize their next actions.

The group reviewed the memorialization and discussed what individual members heard at the work session as direction and priorities for the DEAB. The discussion included the following:

- Regarding the scope or focus for the DEAB, it was interpreted that if the DEAB was willing to review and comment on non-engineering items, than the commissioners were willing to ask them to.
- The commissioners want the DEAB to evaluate the concept of accepting a P.E. stamp on a set of plans and not conducting a review against the code or conditions.
- The commissioners would like DEAB to evaluate how to efficiently process permits once development picks up, without increasing staff.
- Commissioner Boldt does not want the new stormwater code to hinder development.
- Commissioner Stuart is interested in concurrent preliminary site plan and final engineering review.

The group discussed the inability for the DEAB to cover all of these topics while meeting once a month. The idea of creating subcommittees was discussed. Stepan suggested the following possible subcommittees and tasks:

| Efficiencies / Processes/ Level of Service (LOS)   | Community Development "Hot Topics"  | Clark County Code  |
|--|---|--|
| A. Final Engineering – concept of accepting a P.E. stamp as a guarantee and not conducting a review. | A. Title 40 re-write<br>- Process / Overview<br>- Transportation<br>- Design Manual | A. Performance bonds for private improvements            |
| B. Level of Service Issues<br>- Pre-apps (PAC)<br>- Development Inspection<br>- Others               | B. Code Consistency with City of Vancouver  | B. Stormwater – clean up as county begins implementation |
| C. Concurrent site plan and final engineering review   | C. Development Fees / Rate Structure  | C. Biannual code items                                   |
| D. "Preferred" Consultant list (i.e. King County)  | D. Building Division – improved plot plan submittals                                |  |
| E. Case manager / primary portal concept   |   |  |
| F. Signing and Striping process  |   |  |
| G. Electronic plan review  |   |  |

The group decided that one DEAB member would chair each subcommittee. The use of subcommittees would allow more private sector people to learn about the County's processes.

It was decided to prepare a draft invitation to request subcommittee volunteers.

#### Electronic As-Builts

Stepan summarized a proposal to mandate electronic project as-built files. She informed the group of the amount of time required for the manual scanning of Mylar as-builts and the delay in getting the information posted on the County web site.

Stepan informed the group that the code allows this requirement, but historically it has not been a mandatory requirement.

Stepan added that if the DEAB is in agreement with the concept, the county would send out a 30-day notification to the development community and then implement the submittal requirement.

The group discussed the topic; a motion was made to approve requiring electronic as-built files. The DEAB members voted and the motion was approved.

After further discussion, the motion was amended to require an electronic version of the final Technical Information Report as part of the final as-built submittal requirements. The DEAB members voted and the motion was approved.

### Community Development Updates

Marty Snell provided the following updates regarding Community Development:

- An open house has been scheduled for May 21<sup>st</sup> to allow members of the community to comment and help identify issues with the Clark County Code. A second meeting is scheduled for June 11<sup>th</sup>.

After the May meeting, he will summarize what issues were identified and then invite the community to attend the June meeting to discuss solutions. His goal is to submit a report to the BOCC by July 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup>. At that point, the BOCC and staff can determine which items can be added to the biannual code amendment process and which items will require a different process.

- Community Development continues to work with the Auditor's office and the Information Services department to determine a system to track staff time on permits and reviews. It is expected to take some time to put a system in place and be able to both track time and create bills.

The department is looking at developing a fee system that includes a base rate plus an hourly rate.

- In the short term, Snell may ask the BOCC to consider a fee increase proposal that is scaled back from the previous proposal.

### Public Comment Period

There were no additional public comments at this time.

Meeting Minutes Prepared by: Ginger Blair

Reviewed by: Sue Stepan

Board Adopted: JUNE 4, 2009

**Development Engineering Advisory Board - Parking Lot Items**

| #   | PRIORITY* | SUBJECT | DATE<br>REQUESTED | ORIGINATOR | ACTION |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|------------|--------|
|   |           |         |                   |            |        |
|   |           |         |                   |            |        |
|   |           |         |                   |            |        |
|   |           |         |                   |            |        |
| * Priorities: 1 = High/Important, 2 = Average, 3 = Low/long-term goal |           |         |                   |            |        |
|   |           |         |                   |            |        |